DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 783 CG 014 342

TITLE	Removing Children from Adult Jails: A Citizen's Guide to Action.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquent Prevention (Dept. of Justice), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[79]
NOTE	42p.; For related document see CG 014 341.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Children; *Citizen Participation; *Community Action; Community Programs; *Cooperative Planning; *Delinquency; Needs Assessment; Prisoners; Program Development; *Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS	*Jails

ABSTRACT

This citizen's guide is designed to provide suggestions to those individuals or groups concerned with the removal of children from adult jails. The guide presents an overview of the problem, a list of actions which can be taken by an informed and active citizenry, including: (1) monitoring and publicizing admissions practices and living conditions in community jails; (2) participating in state and local planning efforts to remove juveniles from inappropriate confinement; (3) mobilizing existing groups interested in juvenile justice; and (4) volunteering to work with juvenile programs. The appendices contain a list of criminal justice agencies offering technical assistance, and a bibliography. (Author/HLM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED186783

REMOVING CHILDREN FROM ADULT JAILS

A Citizen's Guide to Action

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 014342

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
U.S. Department of Justice

This document has been prepared by the Community Research Forum of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign under a grant from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The fact that the OJJDP furnished financial support for the preparation of this publication does not necessarily indicate concurrence with its contents.

Community Research Forum of the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT
Please do not quote or
distribute without CRF
permission

COMMUNITY
RESEARCH FORUM

PREFACE

Removing Children from Adult Jails: A Citizen's Guide to Action is a companion publication to Removing Children from Adult Jails: A Planner's Guide to Action. Both publications present background material concerning the problem of children in adult jails, the common myths that prevail, national efforts to eliminate the practice, and effective alternatives to its use.

The preparation of companion publications recognizes the important role of citizen as well as official responses to the problem of children in adult jails. The planning guide is intended to provide a methodology for needs assessment and implementation of a flexible network of alternatives at the local level. The citizen's guide provides suggestions to individuals and organizations who wish to participate in efforts to remove children from adult jails. Further, the companion publications are intended to emphasize the importance of official and citizen responses if the problem is to be effectively addressed at the state and local level.

MAR 0 4 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Who are the Children in Jails? 1

Myths about Children in Jails 5

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act 11

Alternatives to Secure Detention 13

You Can Make the Difference: How Citizens Can Help 17

Conclusion 22

Appendix

OJJDP Administrator's Award
Technical Assistance
References

WHO ARE THE CHILDREN IN JAILS?

It is estimated that 500,000 juveniles a year are held in adult jails and lockups in the United States. The Children's Defense Fund states that even the half-million figure is "grossly understated." Although federal legislation requires the separation by sight and sound of juveniles and adult offenders, they are confined together in many states and local communities. In some places, "sight and sound separation" has resulted in juveniles being placed in solitary confinement for long periods.

Most of the children in jails are confined for property or minor offenses. Eighteen percent are in jails for acts such as running away, or being incorrigible," status offenses, which would not be crimes if committed by adults. A recent study by HEW of 755,000 juvenile runaways shows that many were not seeking adventure but were fleeing emotional, physical, and sexual abuse:

> Larry Dye, director of the Youth Development Bureau of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said that a growing number of teen-agers were what the bureau describes as 'throwaways,' young people who are forced out of their homes.
>
> 'We're finding in programs that we're seeing an increase in the number of kids that are being pushed out of their homes, or they leave their homes at 15, 16 years of age by some kind of mutual agreement between the parent and the young person,' Mr. Dye said.
>
> 'When the young are forced out of the homes, we're talking about adolescent abuse, sexual abuse; we're talking about the destruction of the family unit being such that the young people are just told to go out and make it on their own,' he said.
>
> Bill Treanor, director of National Youth Alternatives, a national organization of community-based youth services in Washington, says there is another kind of 'throwaway,' the teen-ager who is forced out of his home for economic reasons.
>
> 'With inflation in general and the housing market in particular, people are living in smaller and smaller units with less and less space, sort of like, just how many little birds can fit in a nest?
>
> Well, somebody gets pushed out and you see this particularly in large cities with minority young people where they just don't fit in the apartment any more; that seems to be an increasing factor of a lot of homeless youth.'

Should these children be exposed to further physical and emotional abuse in adult jails and lockups? Should the government waste money by institutionalizing these children? Since 1974 :

> . . . when Maryland prohibited the locking up of status offenders, communities have reduced their tendency to use the juvenile courts as a dumping ground for truants, runaways and ungovernable youths, according to a recent report. The number of status offenders referred to court has steadily dropped and many more referrals are being closed at court intake. In addition, the state has saved money. The cost

of placing a youngster in a state correctional institution is between a reported $12,000 and $14,000, but a greater number of juveniles are being sent to group homes, which cost $8,200, or placed in foster care at a cost of $2,400.

A 9-state survey by the Children's Defense Fund found that children, including status offenders, frequently "are placed in cells with adults charged with violent crime." They discovered that:

> A 15-year-old girl was confined with a 35-year-old woman jailed for murder.
>
> A 16-year-old boy was confined with a man charged with murder, who raped the boy on three occasions.
>
> A 16-year-old boy, arrested for shoplifting, was confined in a cell with a man charged with shooting another man.
>
> A 16-year-old boy was confined with five men. One was AWOL from the military, one was charged with assault and battery, one was an escaped prisoner from another state, one was in jail charged with murder of his wife, and one was charged with molesting three boys on the street.
>
> A 14-year-old girl was confined in a cell with two women charged with drug use, who constantly cut themselves with pieces of glass.
>
> A 16-year-old boy was confined in a cell with a man charged with murder.
>
> A 15-year-old boy was confined with three adults, two were charged with drunkenness and one with murder.
>
> Inadequate separation also means that children are held in cells with the mentally disabled. We learned that juveniles are regularly mingled with inmates who are mentally ill or retarded or with inmates awaiting competency hearings.

Rape, other forms of physical abuse and harassment, and suicides are just some of the consequences of confining juveniles with adults.

Many of the county jails and municipal lockups in which juveniles are held are in deplorable condition. In Under Lock and Key, Judge Don J. Young described such a jail:

> When the total picture of confinement in the Lucas County Jail is examined, what appears is confinement in cramped and over-crowded quarters, lightless, airless, damp and filthy with leaking water and human wastes, slow starvation, deprivation of most human contacts, except with others in the same subhuman state, no exercise or recreation, little if any medical attention, no attempt at rehabilitation, and for those who in despair or frustration lash out at their surroundings, confinement, stripped of clothing and every last vestige of humanity . . .

In Jails, Ronald Goldfarb notes:

> Since most jail employees are law enforcement personnel, often uninterested in or hostile to their assignments to guard inmates, people in jail are . . . placed in the hands of those who are least likely to teach or exhibit (respect for law and order) . . . the least qualified and the poorest paid employees in the criminal justic system, the jail guards.

American Jails, a publication of the Centennial Congress of Corrections, states:

> The majority of county and city jails are more or less independent units, each having a certain autonomy. The grounds, buildings and equipment are owned by the respective counties and cities. In a majority of cases the buildings are old, badly designed, poorly equipped, and in most instances in need of urgent repairs. They are not properly heated, ventilated nor lighted; they do not have the necessary facilities for the preparation and service of food; proper and adequate provision for bathing and laundering are missing; sanitary arrangements are, for the most part, primitive and in a bad state of repair; only in rare instances are there proper hospital facilities or means for caring for the sick and infirmed; religious services are infrequent; educational activities are almost completely unknown . . . Recreation is mostly restricted to card-playing, and in general, complete idleness is the order of the day. Filth, vermin, homosexuality and degeneracy are rampant, and are the rule rather than the exception. Of these there is no more pressing nor delicate problem, among the many confronting jail administrators today, than the ever-present and increasing problem of homosexual behavior among those incarcerated in jails all over the nation.

The Youngest Minority, a publication of the American Bar Association, asserts:

> Besides deliberate and intentional infliction of discipline in a cruel manner, punishment can also imply a wrong in institutional management that is not erased by good intent and lofty purposes. For example, a fourteen-year-old juvenile was serving ninety days on a chain gang for petty larceny. He was shot in the face by a trusty guard and lost both eyes and suffered brain damage.

Adult jails often lack the most basic medical services. In the questionnaire survey of "medical facilities" in 1,431 jails, the American Medical Association found that 759 provided "First Aid Only." Further investigation revealed that many of the "medical facilities" listed were nothing but first-aid kits.

A recent study by Yale University researchers found that three-quarters or more of the violent children in a Connecticut reform school "had been seriously abused by their parents or caretakers." This included being hit with a belt buckle or whip, and being burned and beaten with a stick. 96%

of this group were "found to have brain or neurologic disorders or psychiatric problems."

In adult jails and lockups, the mental and physical ailments of juveniles, including drug reactions and diabetes, go unnoticed. This neglect can and does lead to unnecessary deaths.

Adult jails are not required to provide educational, recreational, or indeed any services or programs for juveniles. According to the last National Jail Census, many states had no visiting facilities. In an interview with a Children's Defense Fund staffer, a 12-year-old confined in a jail cell in the men's section, said:

> all steel and you can't see nothing. There was nothing to read, nothing to do at all. I did nothing. I screamed at the cops. It's the only thing to do. Then sometimes they'd push me around. The worst thing--it was boring. You could be dying in there and they wouldn't even know. Once I ripped a handle off the wall. I wanted to see if they would see me in the camera. But no one came. Another time I smashed a great big hole in the wall and they didn't know.

Self-reports of juvenile crimes show that nearly 98 percent of all adolescents will commit at least one criminal act which will go unreported to police. But it is poor children, unable to marshall the support of parents, lawyers, or other resources, who are most likely to be jailed. In Jails: The Ultimate Ghetto of the Criminal Justice System, Ronald Goldfarb points out:

> The flexibility of the delinquency concept has aggravated the tendency, already severe, toward class and race discrimination in the administration of juvenile justice. Offenses by young people are common, but, generally, poor children in trouble end up in jails and other correctional institutions. Minority group children are disproportionately represented, white children underrepresented.

MYTHS ABOUT CHILDREN IN JAILS

A number of myths are associated with the jailing of juveniles. We hear most often that these children are dangerous and "the community must be protected." The truth is that while serious lawbreaking receives a great deal of publicity, only about 10% of delinquent youth who appear in court are violent. A 1978 report to the Ford Foundation, Violent Delinquents, reveals that "violent acts by juveniles account for 10-11% of all juvenile arrests . . . repeated violence by juveniles is not a common phenomenon," and "simple assault is the most common violent crime committed by juveniles." A survey by the Children's Defense Fund found that of 162 children for whom jails had recorded charges, only 19 (11.7%) were in jail for alleged dangerous acts. In a study of 1,138 juvenile offenders in Columbus, Ohio, the Academy for Contemporary Problems learned that "Youths arrested for violent offenses constituted less than one-half of 1% of juveniles born in Franklin County, Ohio in 1956-68, and less that 2% of all such persons with a pre-adult police record."

In Children in Jails: Legal Strategies and Materials, the National Center for Youth Law reported that:

> . . . a recent NCCD study, conducted in Upper New York State, revealed 43% of the children in local jails were alleged PINS (persons in need of supervision), none of whom were charged with any crime. A Montana survey found that dependent and neglected children were routinely held in jails; at over half of the jails, children were confined as a deterrent, even absent formal charges against them. The census reported that 2/3 of all juveniles in jail were awaiting trial. In 7 states, all children detained are held in jail and in 21 states, more children are held in jail than in equally available juvenile detention facilities. Analysis of correctional programs in 16 states revealed that 50% of children between 13 and 15 in these programs, had previously been in jail one or more times.

A report on juvenile correctional reform in Massachusetts, prepared by the Center for Criminal Justice at Harvard Law School, compares an "old system" in which all detention was in secure settings, with a "newer system" of detention in open settings, such as shelter care. The report concluded that "In the newer system, since around 80 percent of the youth are in relatively open settings with relatively low recidivism rates, the policy implication is clear. It is possible to put the majority of youth in open settings without exposing the community to inordinate danger."

To protect children from themselves or from dangerous home environments is another rationale for jailing juveniles. The Children's Defense Fund reveals

that,

> in the name of protecting children, we found many youngsters in the filthiest, most neglected and understaffed institutions in the entire correctional system. One child was in jail because her father was suspected of raping her. Since the incest could not be proven, the adult was not held. The child, however, was put in jail for protective custody.

The President's Crime Commission was told of "four teen-age boys, jailed on suspicion of stealing beer, who died of asphyxiation from a defective gas heater, after being left alone for eleven hours in an Arizona jail." In Indiana, a thirteen year old boy, veteran of five foster homes, "drove his current foster father's car to the county jail and asked the sheriff to lock him up. The child was segregated from adults, pending a hearing for auto theft. A week later his body was found hanging from the bars of his cell; a penciled note nearby read, 'I don't belong anywhere.'"

A recent study of North Carolina jails found young males arrested on drinking charges are particularly prone to suicide--usually within the first 24 hours of incarceration.

For children who are abused or self-destructive, being caged with dangerous offenders, in inadequate facilities lacking sufficient or trained staff, is a life-threatening situation. In 1979, the National Coalition for Jail Reform, comprising 29 organizations including the American Bar Association, the National Sheriff's Association, the National League of Cities, the American Insitute of Architecture, and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, unequivocably endorsed "the goal that no child should be held in an adult jail," and stated that, "confinement in an adult jail of any juvenile is an undesirable practice. Such confinement has known negative consequences for youths--sometimes leading to suicide, always bearing life-long implications." The National Coalition for Jail Reform is in accord with Dr. Rosemary Sarri's assertion that:

> Throughout the United States conditions in jails and most detention facilities are poor; they are overcrowded and lack the basic necessities for physical and mental health; supervision and inspection are inadequate, and little or no in-service training is provided. Lack of continuing supervision is especially problematic for jailed youth, since they can be abused by adult prisoners.

In a four-year study conducted by New York State's Select Committee on Child Abuse, a "definite link" between child abuse and neglect and juvenile delinquency was shown. Reviewing this, and similar findings in other studies

from across the nation, Gwen Ingram, director of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency Youth Center, concludes, "If children first visit court as victims and receive no assistance, they return to the same problems and develop survival skills that often cause their return to court as the accused."

Children are also put in jails, "To teach them a good lesson." However this lesson often backfires. In their Dangerous Offender Project, a three-year effort funded by the Lilly Endorsement, the Academy for Contemporary Problems discovered that, "Incarceration seems to speed up, rather than retard, the recidivism of the 'violent few' among juvenile offenders." The researchers charge that "Juvenile court dispositions swing from a total lack of punishment at the beginning of a criminal career to overly harsh incarceration a few crimes later on." Early on, "A youth learns that he can break the law and not be punished. He is unimpressed with the seriousness of the law." When finally put behind bars, he is likely to regard it as merely "the luck of the draw." The study concludes, that "legislators and judges ought to devise intermediate sanction measures that will make incarceration less frequently necessary. Among these might be restitution, community service orders, restrictions to a group home, and other losses of liberty designed to show that the court means business."

The lavishly praised "Scared Straight" program, in which prison inmates brutally try to frighten youngsters out of careers as lawbreakers by sneering, making homosexual advances, and offering tales of how men are crippled in jails, has been shown to be a failure. A recent study by Rutgers Professor James O. Finckenauer traced 46 juveniles who had graduated from the Rahway prison sessions and set up a control group of 35 similar youths who had not attended them. "Contrary to televised claims that 80 to 90 percent of the project's alumni had stayed out of trouble, Finckenauer found that only 59 percent of his subjects avoided arrest; in contrast 89 percent of the control group had not been arrested. Worse yet, of nineteen youngsters who went to Rahway with no criminal record, six later broke the law." According to Newsweek reporters Aric Press and Donna Foote, "Many authorities express shock that unspeakable prison conditions, instead of being corrected, are being touted as a remedy for youth crime."

Children are terrified by jails. They associate them with abuse--homosexual abuse, abuse by guards, and abuse by other prisoners. As a result,

they learn they cannot trust adults charged with carrying out the law. They learn to hate. Milton G. Rector, President, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, states:

> The fact that murders and other violent crimes are committed by children does not make the criminal justice system any more suited to the task of control and rehabilitation of young people. Every study of prisons for adults has demonstrated the disabling effects and inappropriateness of prison environment for bringing about positive change in attitudes and behavior. The intensive, specialized efforts needed for the serious young offender have a better chance to evolve from programs and experimentation within the juvenile system.
>
> The act of remanding violent young offenders to the criminal courts is often a surrender and a cop-out by otherwise responsible public officials. In too many cases it is a political ploy to appear tough on crime rather than face up to the need for an intelligent attempt to cope with serious crimes by children within the juvenile justice system and to contend with the causes of such crimes.
>
> It is ironic that leaders in the juvenile justice field choose to push the most serious offenders into the criminal courts and to devote their resources to truants, runaways, and unruly children, who were pushed into their laps by education, welfare and mental health systems which also prefer to appear tough rather than smart.

Law enforcement officials and judges often regret jailing children, but justify their actions in the belief that, "Juvenile detention facilities are unavailable, overcrowded or inappropriate." The fact is that even where detention centers are readily available and existing legislation prohibits the jailing of juveniles, children are still placed in jails. In 7 out of 8 states where surveys were conducted by the Community Research Center of the University of Illinois, it was found that the availability of detention centers did not in itself preclude children from being placed in jails. The Children's Defense Fund discovered that several thousand children were confined in adult jails every year in a Texas county with a large detention center. Where the practice of jailing children is permitted legally, or through lack of enforcement of statutory prohibitions, jails will be used to hold children.

Overcrowding of juvenile centers should not be used as an excuse for jailing children, since many could be released or held in a community-based setting pending trial. A survey of the effects of an employees' strike, which resulted in the furloughing of many juveniles from state training schools in Pennsylvania, found that "of 426 young people released for a period of two days to three weeks, nearly all returned without incident."

In Confronting Youth Crime, a report by the Twentieth Century Fund, a task force chaired by former Ohio Senator Robert Taft, concluded that preventive pre-trial detention is "inappropriate and unjust," and that community supervision, rather than detention, should be utilized to insure that young defendents appear for trial. However, the Supreme Court, which has broadened the rights of children charged with delinquent acts, has yet to act at all on procedural guarantees for young people facing legal sanctions for "misbehavior or uncontrollability."

Children who are mentally ill or seriously retarded, and difficult to place are also put in jails. A Children's Defense Fund team discovered children in jails who were on waiting lists for mental hospitals, along with children who simply had no place to go. "One boy's mother had been hospitalized, and because no relative or neighbor had been able to take him the sheriff took him to jail." In Under Lock and Key, Dr. Rosemary Sarri notes that in Montana where dependent and neglected children were held in jail "when necessary," "Juveniles could remain in jail for indefinite periods since only a few counties or cities had procedures for controlling the maximum number of days they could be held." Can we not provide more humane treatment than homes in jail cells for dependent and neglected children?

The final myth concerning the jailing of children is that it is appropriate to "jail children who have been waived from juvenile court to adult criminal court," a practice which is increasing. Guided by public fears and pressures, many broad statutes are being enacted to permit juveniles who have committed simple assaults are swept up with those who murder or rape. "All these laws will do is lock a few kids up for a longer period of time," says Marcia Lowry of the ACLU's Children's Rights Project. More than that, they will legally subject juveniles including less serious offenders to the risks and harms of comingling with adult criminals.

In Florida, a 16 year-old boy was waived to an adult court for purse-snatching. He spent 201 days in an adult maximum security facility, much of it in solitary confinement, while his case was repeatedly continued in adult court. He became increasingly disturbed, telling an officer he would set the place on fire if he was not let out.

> The officer reported this to the supervisor and was told to watch the prisoner's conduct carefully to determine if additional solitary confinement procedures should be used. Within five minutes, smoke was found coming from polyurethane mattresses stored outside the cell, which the prisoner apparently had ignited by throwing lighted

newspaper near them.

One officer and ten prisoners, including the boy himself, lost their lives in this fire. Yet in 1978, Florida enacted a law permitting states' attorneys to prosecute in adult court any 16 or 17 year-old who has previously committed two delinquent acts, one of which is a felony. Felonies may include such acts as auto theft and selling marijuana. Having been deprived even of a waiver hearing, the juvenile may then be tried and handled in every respect as if he were an adult. And similar statutes are being enacted despite official crime statistics which show juvenile crime lessening in many areas.

THE JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 1974

In 1973, the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency heard clear and convincing testimony concerning the harmful effects of comingling juvenile and adult offenders:

> Regardless of the reasons that might be brought forth to justify jailing juveniles, the practice is destructive for the child who is incarcerated and dangerous for the community that permits youth to be handled in harmful ways.

From this and similar testimony came the Juvenile and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

The requirements of the Act with respect to juveniles in adult jails and lockups are embodied in section 223 a (13):

> (13) provide that juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent and (status and non-offenders) shall not be detained or confined in any institution in which they have regular contact with adult persons incarcerated because they have been convicted of a crime or are awaiting trial on criminal charges.

The implementation of the Act has been directed principally towards changing the traditional practice of institutionalizing juveniles. Schools, parents, police, the courts, and the community in general, have been required to examine their perceptions of juvenile delinquency and their methods of dealing with youth in trouble. Recent research and national standards have provided strong support for the mandates of the Act, particularly with respect to the removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups.

Still, in most states, the criteria for secure detention of a juvenile are that he be "likely to run, likely to commit a new offense, or likely to harm himself." This concept of "likely to" has been denounced as vague and subjective by the American Bar Association, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, and other organizations concerned with juvenile justice standards. They assert that language such as "likely to" gives too much latitude to law enforcement officers and others who make decisions about releasing or detaining children. Views of what constitutes "the best interests of a child," or which child is "likely to" engage in harmful behavior are as varied as the attitudes of each arresting officer. Organizations such as the American Bar Association suggest that specific criteria including type of offense, legal history, and legal status be used in determining whether to detain or release a child. In this way, decisions can be reached irrespective of sex, race, appearance, socio-economic status, access

to legal counsel, etc.

Studies by the Community Research Forum of the University of Illinois show that where objective standards concerning juveniles have been adopted, reductions of up to 80 percent have occurred in the number of youth requiring secure detention.

While the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act holds that juveniles can be detained in adult jails and lockups as long as they are kept separate from adult offenders, "separation" is poorly defined in most state statutes. Often, a reading of the statute does not clarify whether juveniles are ever permitted in adult jails, or if they may be held in adult jails, if they are separated from adults. What is meant by "separation" is also unclear to physical, sight, sound or other separation, and open to individual interpretation. In addition, these statutes are neither specific nor objective as to which juveniles to release and which to detain, further allowing personal biases to influence such decisions.

In response to the Act, however, several states have moved in the direction of an outright prohibition on jailing juveniles. Maryland, Washington, and Pennsylvania have legislated such a prohibition during the last two years.

Recent court litigation has also supported this prohibition. In Witite v. Reid, the jailing of children was denounced as lacking due process, and in Baker v. Hamilton as cruel and unusual punishment. In Swansey v. Elrod, the court extended the prohibition against jail confinement to children who have been waived or certified to adult court.

These legal arguments, further extended by the National Coalition for Jail Reform and the National Center for Youth Law, show the potential for a court decision regarding the constitutionality of jailing children.

ALTERNATIVES TO SECURE DETENTION

> Joan M., 14 years old, ran away from home because she did not get along with her mother. Eric, 17, left because there was not enought room for him at home.
>
> Both needed help. And they found it at a runaway house here (Washington, D.C.), one of the many facilities in the country that provides short-term aid to such youngsters.
>
> The New York Times, May 20, 1979

There are many examples of successful alternatives to the secure detention of juveniles. In their careful analysis of home detention, attention homes, runaway programs, and private residential homes, University of Chicago researchers Thomas Young and Donnell Pappenfort found that upwards of 90% of juveniles in programs providing alternatives to secure detention neither committed new offenses nor ran away. The following is a summary of their study, Secure Detention of Juveniles and Alternatives to its Use,* which was conducted under a grant from the LEAA:

Home detention programs permit youths to reside with their parents while meeting with probation officer aides at least daily. Some jurisdictions emphasize the supervision and surveillance aspects of this approach, while others stress the service components. But all seven programs studied authorized the aides to send a youth directly to secure detention when he or she did not fulfill program requirements such as daily contact with the aide, or attendance at job or school. Programs studied were Community Detention of Baltimore; Outreach Detention Program of Newport News, VA; Non-Secure Detention of Panama City, FL; Home Detention of St. Joseph/Benton Harbor, MI; Home Detention Program of St. Louis, MO; Community Release Program of San Jose, CA; and Home Detention Program of Washington, DC.

Attention Homes are group homes usually housing between five and 12 juveniles plus one set of live-in house-parents. Frequently the home is a converted single family dwelling in a residential neighborhood so that the juveniles can continue attending their schools. Social service workers are often available to the juveniles and to the adults providing care. The research team studied Discovery House Inc. of Anaconda, MI; Holmes-Hargadine Attention Home of Boulder, CO; and Attention Home of Helena, MT.

Runaway programs are also group residences, but they differ in certain respects from each other and from the attention homes. Amicus House of Pittsburgh is designed for runaway youths from that area. Admission is not limited to juveniles referred from detention intake, and the program emphasized inten-

sive counseling to resolve immediate crises, followed by referrals for longer-term help if needed. In contrast, Transient Youth Center of Jacksonville, FL is geared to youths who are primarily from other states and who are brought in by police and court officials. Youths usually only stay a short time since the primary goal is to help them return to their natural parents.

Private residential foster homes can be quite different from one another. For example, the Proctor Program in New Bedford, MA is run by a private social work agency. It pays single women aged 20-30 to take one girl at a time into their homes for 24-hour care and supervision while agency staff develop full treatment plans. In contrast, the program studied in Springfield, MA is a network of foster homes (two beds each), two group homes (five beds each), and a "receiving unit" group home (four beds). Beside the foster parents and group home parents, a small number of professional staff provide counseling and advocacy services. This relatively extensive program was credited with helping Springfield to have a very low detention rate for a city its size.

PROGRAM RESULTS. For the 14 programs studied the 'failure rates'--i.e. proportions of youths allegedly committing new offenses or running away while in the program--ranged from 2.4% to 12.8%.

None of the four types of program was associated with consistently better or worse failure rates, and 'similar programs can produce different results' in different contexts, according to the study.

The researchers concede that their 'failure rates' are open to challenge by those who claim that in home detention programs any juvenile referred to secure detention represents a 'failure.' If this criterion were used, the failure rates for the seven home detention programs in the study ranged from 8.1% to 24.8%.

RECOMMENDATIONS OFFERED. Young and Pappenfort offer several conclusions for the benefit of communities considering alternatives-to-detention programs, among them the following:

--Since overuse of secure detention continues in many parts of the country, the main alternative should not be another program. A large proportion of youths should simply be released to their parents or guardians to await court action.

--The various program formats appear to be roughly equal in their ability to keep their charges out of trouble and available to the court.

--The higher rates of failure appear to be due to factors outside the

control of program employees, such as excessive lengths of stay caused by slow court processing.

--Residential programs, i.e. group homes and foster homes, are being used successfully for both alleged delinquents and status offenders.

--The attention home format seems well suited to the needs of less populated jurisdictions, where separate programs for several special groups may not be feasible. It is also suitable for a mixed population of alleged delinquents, status offenders, and others.

--A range of types of alternative programs should probably be made available in jurisdictions other than the smallest ones.

--Even when alternatives are available, certain courts are 'unnecessarily timid' in defining the kinds of juveniles to be assigned to them.

In the state of Michigan, and in Spokane, Washington, highly successful crisis intervention programs have been developed involving round-the-clock intake services.

In Michigan, skilled professionals, youth attendants (individuals recruited from the community to work on an hourly basis), and foster parents combine to provide emergency care for serious offenders awaiting court appearances. In 1978, this program placed 1,300 youths in 32 separate foster homes, and had a truancy rate of only 10 percent.

Spokane's program uses a team of professionals and paraprofessionals who provide an alternative to juvenile court intake 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. On call to the police, the team goes wherever a family crisis involving a juvenile has developed, and attempts to stabilize the crisis situation. Where necessary, the team makes referrals to community agencies, and follows up on their outcome. In four months, this program reduced the number of status offenders referred to juvenile court by 60%. And in fact, placement in shelter facilities was not needed as much as expected, since often the crisis intervention was enought to handle the problem.

There will continue to be a steady, if irregular need for secure detention for some juveniles charged with serious offenses. But isolating juvenile offenders into substandard living conditions in adult jails will not answer that need. Nor will the indiscriminate use of a separate secure detention facility. There must be flexibility in handling juvenile offenders, so that the number of juveniles in secure settings, including adult jails and lockups, is reduced. This can be accomplished through the use of specific criteria

for release or detention, 24-hour intake screening, next-day court appearance, regular review of all detention cases, and a network of alternative programs.

YOU CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE: HOW CITIZENS CAN HELP

In this country, it is often said that, "children are our most precious resource." Yet, "Adults don't seem to like kids just now," comments Michael Dale, executive director of An Francisco's Juvenile Justice Legal Advocacy Project. "Parents, judges and legislators want to lock them up when they go wrong." "Politicians often look for simplistic solutions," according to Newsweek writers Frederick V. Boyd and Linda Walters, "but the problems involved in administering the juvenile justice system are extraordinarily complicated. The courts must deal with two kinds of youthful lawbreakers: the basic criminal types who rob and murder, and the mixed-up kids (status offenders) who run away from home or become truants." Children's Defense Fund Director, Marion Wright Edelman, notes that, "for too long policy-makers have paid attention only to special interest lobby groups and no attention to the needs of children who don't vote . . . advocates for children have been viewed as soft, unorganized, uncoordinated, and not much to worry about. This has resulted in children's needs being last on everybody's totem pole."

But the indiscriminate jailing of children can be stopped. Concerned citizens, acting independently and through organized groups, can become a powerful force in promoting public interest and support for the removal of children from adult jails and lockups. The target for their efforts must include not only jails and jailers, but the system which involves all who use jails or who, by inaction, permit this abuse to continue. Citizen groups can press for more effective, humane, less costly alternatives to secure detention, and not submit to those who wish to place children in adult jails.

Chief Justice Warren Burger, speaking before the National Conference on Corrections, stated:

> . . . it is my deep conviction that when society places a person behind walls, we assume a collective moral responsibility to try to change and help that person. The law will define legal duties but I confess I have more faith in what a moral commitment of the American people can accomplish than I have in what can be done by the compulsion of judicial decrees.

An informed and active citizenry can:

(1) MONITOR THE ADMISSIONS PRACTICES AND LIVING CONDITIONS IN THE JAILS AND LOCKUPS IN THEIR OWN COMMUNITY AND REPORT THIS INFORMATION TO CITIZEN GROUPS, THE PUBLIC, THE MEDIA, PROFESSIONAL GROUPS, CITY, COUNTY, AND STATE OFFICIALS, AND OTHER INTERESTED PERSONS.

This includes touring the facility and asking the following questions:

--What is their physical layout: the cleanliness, the plumbing, the heating, the ventilation, and the lighting?

--What provisions are made for emergency admissions, regular medical services, and mental health services?

--What, if any, arrangements are made for keeping inmates occupied?

--Is there provision for regular out-of-door exercise, education or other recreation?

--How long are children held in the local jails?

--Is supervision available 24 hours per day?

--Are the jails used to hold mentally ill, mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed children?

--Are the jails used to "shelter" neglected or abused children in the absence of appropriate foster care facilities?

--Are the jails used to hold children charged with status offenses, including truancy, disobedience to parents, violations or curfew?

--Does the state plan required by the 1974 Juvenile Justice Act as a condition to receiving federal grants provide for the establishment of alternative facilities, and how have they been implemented?

In Inspecting Children's Institutions, the National Coalition for Children's Justice describes methods of conducting an inspection of children's institutions, many of which are valuable in the inspection of adult jails and lockups.*

An outstanding example of how citizens can assist significantly in reducing the number of children in jails is the Alston Wilkes Society's Jail Services Committees program, established in many areas of South Carolina. Working in conjunction with the South Carolina Youth Bureau, volunteers check the local jails twice daily to see if status offenders are being held. When status offenders are discovered, the volunteers phone the Youth Bureau. Youth workers then try to arrange emergency housing with local families, reunite juveniles with their own families, and refer the youths for day or residential counseling programs. A survey of the effects of this program in Spartansburg,

*For more information write the National Coalition for Children's Justice, 66 Witherspoon Street, Princeton, New Jersey, 924-0902.

South Carolina shows that, "the number of youths held in jail has been reduced 32 percent and the time they spend behind bars reduced 72 percent." There is no cost for the volunteer project.*

Partly in response to the problem of children in adult jails, the Children's Defense Fund, a Washington, D.C. based child advocacy group is developing a "Children's Public Policy Network," at the national, state and local levels. The network will work with local child advocates in educating the public about children's needs and in making those needs known to policy makers. The network provides:

> a toll free number for child advocates who need current and accurate information on national policy developments affecting children (800-424-0602).
>
> information exchange and referral on positive policies, practices, programs, and activities that can be used as models.
>
> a series of "how-to-do-it" pamphlets for use by local child advocates in pursuing local change.
>
> technical assistance by fulltime network staff to bolster the effectiveness and coordination of groups and individuals.
>
> policy briefings on federal developments of importance to children and families.

The aim of the Children's Defense Fund is to keep children in the home by resolving family or parent/child problems, so that institutionalization becomes unnecessary. The Children's Defense Fund publication, Children in Adult Jails, provides a complete checklist of practices and policies related to the jailing of children.**

> (2) PARTICIPATE IN STATE AND LOCAL PLANNING EFFORTS TO REMOVE JUVENILES FROM INAPPROPRIATE CONFINEMENT, INCLUDING ADULT JAILS AND LOCKUPS.
>
> The Juvenile Justic and Delinquency Prevention Act mandates that each state receiving funds under the Act establish an advisory group in juvenile justice and delinquency prevention, which may:
>
> ...participate in the development and review of the state's juvenile justice plan;

*For more information write the Alston Wilkes Society, P.O. Box 363, Columbia, South Carolina 29202.

**For more information write the Children's Defense Fund, 1520 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

...advise the state Planning agency and its supervisory board;

...advise the Governor and the legislature on matters related to its functions, as requested;

...have an opportunity for review and comment on all juvenile justice and delinquency prevention grant applications;

...be given a role in monitoring state compliance with requirements to deinstitutionalization of status offenders and removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups, advising the state planning agency on the composition of the state supervisory board and maintenance of effort and the review of the progress and accomplishments of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention projects funded under the comprehensive state plan.

The Act requires the advisory group to be appointed by the chief executive of the state, with the stipulation that a majority of members, including the chairperson, not be full-time employees of the federal, state or local governments.

Many cities, counties, and governmental agencies establish similar advisory groups at the local level, or temporary task forces with specific objectives. For example, thirteen members of the West Virginia State Advisory Group conducted on-site inspections of 55 county jails to examine living conditions, the extent to which juveniles were being held in these facilities, and the degree of contact between juveniles and adult offenders. The members worked in teams and completed all inspections in a 60-day period. The quality of the information was good, serving as the basis of the State Monitoring Report to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency. Total cost was $1000 and each of the SAG members felt it was a valuable experience which provided first-hand information on the problems of children in adult jails.

In Lexington, Kentucky, the Fayette County Juvenile Justice Coalition was formed in response to a court order prohibiting the use of the county jail for juveniles. Composed of citizens and professional organizations, the Coalition was instrumental in planning alternative programs to adult jails.

(3) MOBILIZE EXISTING GROUPS WITH AN INTEREST IN JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ON THE ISSUE OF CHILDREN IN JAILS.

Groups such as service clubs, professional and fraternal organizations, business associations, labor unions, and private child advocacy groups have contributed long hours of voluntary services as well as organizational influence to create change in the criminal justice system at all levels.

The Association of Junior Leagues, Inc., has produced a guide for citizens who want to improve criminal justice procedures and resources. This "how to" handbook is based on a two-year study of 50 individual Junior League projects and offers case studies of eight of these. The handbook was produced with the aid of a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.*

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency and the Community Services Department of the AFL-CIO have cooperated in establishing educational programs to acquaint workers with the criminal justice system in their communities.

The Florida Center for Children and Youth conducted a statewide examination of admission procedures, living conditions, and detention practices in the state's adult jails and lockups. They discovered many factors which perpetuated the jailing of children, enabling them to make inexpensive but high impact recommendations to the state legislature, state agencies, and jail officials.

(4) VOLUNTEER TO WORK ON PROGRAMS FOR JUVENILES WHICH PRESENT ALTERNATIVES TO JAILS AND DETENTION CENTERS.

Nationally, there are noteworthy programs where volunteers help provide alternatives to adult jails and other types of secure detention.

When Florida prohibited the detention of status offenders, the Division of Youth Services developed a system of volunteer coordinators to recruit foster parents, plan and implement funding, and organize volunteers to assist these children. Foster parents are interviewed, carefully checked for qualifications, and approved by the court in a formal ceremony. There are now 900 volunteer foster homes in the program--which provides youngsters a comfortable place to stay, with little stigma attached, at a cost of about $4.75 a day. The keystone of the program is the volunteer coordinator, who keeps in constant contact with the family, lending both real and moral support.

*For more information, write Impact Project Director, the Association of Junior Leagues, Inc., 825 Third Avenue, New York, New York.

CONCLUSION

A recent book, the Value of Youth: A Call for a National Youth Policy, ed. by Arthur Pearl, J.D. Grant, and Ernest Wenk, looks at youth as an effective force for solving problems they create primarily through projects involving youth participation. It examines promising programs through which young people are helping to improve their communities, and calls for a positive federal youth policy in which "youth are seen as resources rather than as problems to be solved by adults."

Children are our most precious resource. Rather than locking up wayward children in adult jails, and throwing away the key, we must see the humane treatment of children as the key to a healthy society.

An Alston Wilkes Society volunteer tells us about a twelve year-old boy being taken to a volunteer emergency home after spending several days in jail:

> He had been found by a motel owner asleep behind the ice machine to keep warm. The owner called the police who put him in a cell for lack of an alternative. The counselor who was taking the boy to the emergency home had a bumper sticker on his car which said, 'Runaway children don't belong in jail.' The boy stopped, read the bumper sticker and became very serious. He turned to the counselor and said, 'Thank you.'

While clear and concise state legislation is the foundation for a prohibition on jailing children, experience indicates that it does not eliminate the practice. Only an informed and concerned citizenry can stop the indiscriminate jailing of children and put an end to the revolving door of child abuse, delinquency, incarceration, and crime.

Appendix

OJJDP Administrator's Award

Technical Assistance

References

OJJDP ADMINISTRATOR'S AWARD

The adversarial and controversial actions required to remove juveniles from adult jails and lockups often go unnoticed by the general public even though they may extract considerable individual or organizational energy to accomplish. The identification and recognition of extraordinary efforts on behalf of children in jail is an essential ingredient in the continued struggle to achieve responsible legislation and monitor its enforcement by citizens and the juvenile justice system alike.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention urges all concerned to recommend such individuals or organizations for the Administrator's Award for outstanding efforts in this area. Recommendations will be reviewed on a regular basis by a panel of citizens in conjunction with the local criminal justice planning office.

Awards will be announced in the recipients' local newspaper, in the CHANGE newsletter, and notification given to the recipients' congressional delegation.

Recommendations should be submitted with a description of the individual or organizational effort to:

Administrator's Award
Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention
633 Indiana Avenue NW
Washington DC 20531

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has developed a substantial technical assistance program to assist state agencies and local programs in combating the problems associated with delinquency more effectively. The OJJDP technical assistance strategy is based on the idea that dealing with juvenile crime and addressing inadequacies in the juvenile justice system will require well-timed technical help in addition to initial funding allocations. Technical assistance is geared to transferring knowledge and skills to recipients, which will not only help them solve their own problems in a cost saving manner, but will also enable them to serve as a resource both to their communities and to other projects with similar objectives. The federal role, while critical at the outset, can then be diminished as states and local governments gain self-sufficiency. The dual objective of the technical assistance program is to resolve a specific problem, and, at the same time, increase the long-term capability of the recipient to solve its own problem.

Priorities for the technical assistance program include the support of the OJJDP's Formula Grants Program, Special Emphasis Program, Concentration of Federal Effort, and Standards Program. Each of these priorities is defined for the OJJDP in its authorizing legislation, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

The Formula Grants are awarded to state governments and are intended to promote the development of a comprehensive and coordinated juvenile justice and delinquency prevention system. Three particular provisions of the Formula Grants Program require states to:

-- remove status offenders and nonoffenders, such as dependent and neglected children and youth from institutions (deinstitutionalization);
-- provide that delinquent youths be separated from incarcerated adults; and
-- develop a monitoring system to insure that the above two provisions are met.

While states are particularly concerned with meeting these provisions, the technical assistance response in support of the Formula Grants Program must also be able to address the myriad needs that legitimately surface in trying to meet the requirements of the legislation. These include numerous other kinds of juvenile justice and youth system improvements, such as establishing delinquency prevention efforts, shoring up existing juvenile courts and corrections facilities, and improving the quality of juvenile care and treatment.

Under a grant from the OJJDP, the Community Research Forum of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign currently provides technical assistance to state and local agencies concerning the issues of inappropriate confinement, including the removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups. A multi-disciplinary team of behavioral scientists, lawyers, and architects has been developed to provide assistance in the planning and implementation of alternatives to juvenile jailing.

Research projects are currently underway and directed toward the barriers which exist at the state and local level to accomplish this goal. To support these research efforts and respond to information requests from the field, particular attention has been given to the development of an information resource center on the general subject of deinstitutionalization.

The Community Research Forum is currently providing technical assistance to public and private agencies in 29 states. The methodology utilized in these projects focuses on a six-step planning process designed to (1) elicit broad citizen participation in the planning, implementation, and monitoring aspects of deinstitutionalization, (2) provide a sound data base by which to assess existing juvenile justice practices, and (3) develop a flexible network of alternative programs and services to meet the individual needs of each youth.

A major area of project emphasis concerns the implementation of a public education strategy to enhance community and official awareness of the problem of juveniles in adult jails and lockups. This includes public education materials, media awareness, and workshop training sessions for those persons who will manage or influence services for youth awaiting court appearance.

Technical assistance is also available in several other areas specifically directed to implementation of the Act. All requests for technical assistance or information on State Advisory Groups and youth advocacy activities should be addressed to the appropriate state planning agency or directly to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 633 Indiana Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20531.

Alabama Law Enforcement Planning Agency
2863 Fairlane Drive, Executive Park
Building F, Suite 49
Montgomery AL, 36111

Office of Criminal Justice Planning
Pouch AJ
Juneau AK 99801

Criminal Justice Planning Agency
Government of American Samoa
PO Box 7
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799

Arizona State Justice Planning Agency
Continental Plaza Building
5119 North 19th Avenue
Phoenix AZ 85015

Governor's Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement
1515 Building
Suite 700
Little Rock AR 72202

Office of Criminal Justice Palnning
7171 Bowling Drive
Sacramento CA 95823

Division of Criminal Justice
Department of Local Affairs
1313 Sherman, Room 419
Denver CO 80203

Planning Committee on Criminal Administration
75 Elm Street
Hartford CT 06115

Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice
1228 Scott Street
Wilmington DE 19803

Office of Criminal Justice Plans and Analysis
Munsey Building, Suite 200
1329 E Street NW
Washington DC 20004

Bureau of Criminal Justice Planning and Assistance
530 Carlton Building
Tallahassee FL 32304

State Crime Commission
Suite 625
3400 Peachtree Road
Atlanta GA 30326

Territorial Crime Commission
Office of the Governor
Agana, Guam 96910

State Law Enforcement and Juvenile Delinquency
Planning Agency
Kamamalu Building, Room 412
1010 Richards Street
Honolulu HI 96813

Law Enforcement Planning Commission
700 West State Street
Boise ID 83720

Illinois Law Enforcement Commission
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago IL 60606

Indiana Criminal Justice Planning Agency
215 North Senate
Indianapolis IN 46202

Iowa Crime Commission
Lucas Office Building, First Floor
Des Moines IA 50319

Governor's Committee on Criminal Administration
503 Kansas Avenue, Second Floor
Topeka KS 66603

Executive Office of Staff Services
Department of Justice
209 St. Clari Street, Third Floor
Frankfort KY 40601

Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement
and Administration of Criminal Justice
1885 Wooddale Boulevard, Room 615
Baton Rouge LA 70806

Maine Law Enforcement Planning and Assistance Agency
11 Parkwood Drive
Augusta ME 04330

Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement
and Administration of Justice
1 Investment Place
Towson MD 21204

Committee on Criminal Justice
110 Tremont Street, Sourth Floor
Boston MA 02108

Office of Criminal Justice Programs
Lewis Cass Building, Second Floor
Lansing MI 48913

Crime Control Planning
444 Larayette Road, Sixth Floor
St. Paul MN 55101

Mississippi Criminal Justice Planning Division
Office of the Governor
723 North President, Suite 400
Jackson MS 39202

Missouri Council on Criminal Justice
PO Box 1041
621 East Capital
Jefferson City MO 65101

Board of Crime Control
1336 Helena Avenue
Helena MT 59601

Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and
Criminal Justice
State Capitol Building
Lincoln NE 68509

Commission on Crime, Delinquency and Corrections
430 Jeanell, Capitol Complex
Carson City NV 89710

Governor's Commission on Crime and Delinquency
169 Manchester Street
Concord NH 03301

Law Enforcement Planning Agency
3535 Quaker Bridge Road
Trenton NJ 08625

Governor's Council on Criminal Justice Planning
425 Old Santa Fe Trail, Lamy Building
Santa Fe NM 87501

Division of Criminal Justice Services
270 Broadway, Eighth Floor
New York NY 10007

North Carolina Department of Natural and
Economic Resources
Law and Order Division
PO Box 27687
Raleigh NC 27611

North Dakota Combined Law Enforcement Council
Box B
Bismarck ND 58501

Administration of Justice Division
30 East Broad Street, 26th Floor
Columbus OH 43215

Oklahoma Crime Commission
3033 North Walnut
Oklahoma City OK 73105

Law Enforcement Council
2001 Front Street NE
Salem OR 97310

Governor's Justice Commission
Department of Justice
PO Box 1167, Federal Square Station
Harrisburg PA 17108

Puerto Rico Crime Commission
GPO Box 1256
San Juan PR 00936

Governor's Committee on Crime, Delinquency
and Criminal Administration
197 Taunton Avenue
East Providence RI 02914

Office of Criminal Justice Programs
Edgar Brown State Office Building
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia SC 29201

South Dakota State Criminal Justice Commission
200 West Pleasant Drive
Pierre SD 57501

Tennessee Law Enforcement Planning Agency
Browning-Scott Building, First Floor
4950 Linbar Drive
Nashville TN 37211

Criminal Justice Council, Executive Department
411 West 13th Street
Austin TX 78701

Law Enforcement Planning Agency
State Office Building, Room 304
255 South Third, East
Salt Lake City UT 84111

Vermont Commission on the Administration of Justice
149 State Street
Montpelier VT 05602

Division of Justice and Crime Prevention
8501 Mayland Drive
Richmond VA 23229

Virgin Island Law Enforcement Commission
Box 280, Charlotte Amalie
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00801

Law and Justice Planning Office
201 General Administration Building
AX-21 Mail Stop
Olympia WA 98504

Governor's Committee on Crime, Delinquency
and Correction
Morris Square, Suite 321
Charleston WV

Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice
122 West Washington Avenue
Madison WI 53702

Governor's Planning Committee on Criminal Administration
Barrett Building, Fourth Floor
Cheyenne WY 82002

REFERENCES

Allison, Richard, Status Offenders and the Juvenile Justice System, An Anthology, Hackensack, New Jersey: NCCD, 1978.
Contact NCCD Continental Plaza, 411 Hackensack Avenue, Hackensack NJ 07601.

American Bar Association, The Youngest Minority: Lawyers in Defense of Children, Chicago, Illinois: ABA Press, 1974.

American Bar Association, Survey and Handbook on State Standards and Inspection Legislation for Jails and Juvenile Detention Facilities, Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services: Washington, D.C., 1978.

American Bar Association/Institute of Judicial Administration, Standards for Juvenile Justice: A Survey and Analysis, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Company, 1977.
Contact Ballinger Publishing Company, 17 Dunston Street, Harvard Square, Cambridge MA 02138.

American Bar Association/Institute of Judicial Administration, Standards Relating to Architecture of Facilities, 1977.
Contact Ballinger Publishing Company.

American Bar Association/Institute of Judicial Administration, Standards Relating to Interim Status: The Release, Control, Detention of Accused Juvenile Offenders Between Arrest and Disposition, 1977.
Contact Ballinger Publishing Company.

American Bar Association/Institute of Judicial Administration, Standards Relating to Planning for Juvenile Justice, 1977.
Contact Ballinger Publishing Company.

American Bar Association/Institute of Judicial Administration, Standards Relating to Monitoring, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Balinger Publishing Company, 1977.

Children's Defense Fund, Children in Adult Jails, Washington, DC: Washington Research Project, Inc., December, 1976.
Contact Children's Defense Fund, 1520 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington DC 20036.

Children's Defense Fund, Children Without Homes, 1979.
Contact Children's Defense Fund.

Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, Manual of Standards for Juvenile Community Residential Services, Rockville, Maryland: CAC, April, 1978.
Contact Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, 6110 Executive Blvd., Suite 750, Rockville MD 20852.

Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, Manual of Standards for Juvenile Local Detention Facilities, Rockville, Maryland: CAC, 1978 (scheduled for publication in early 1979).
Contact Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, 6110 Executive Blvd., Suite 750, Rockville MD 20852.

Community Research Forum, Residential Environments for the Juvenile Justice System: A Deinstitutionalization Perspective, Urbana Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1978.
Contact Community Research Forum, 505 East Green Street, Suite 210, Champaign IL 61820.

Davis, Samuel M., Rights of Juveniles: The Juvenile Justice System, New York, New York: Clark Boardman Company, 1974.

Goldfarb, Ronald, Jails: The Ultimate Ghetto of the Criminal Justice System,

Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, The Detention and Jailing of Juveniles, 93rd Congress, First Session, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974.

Jones, M. L., American Jails, Centennial of Congress on Corrections: Washington, D.C., 1970.

Juvenile Delinquency Interdepartmental Council, Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice, Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, 1974.
Contact Superintendent of Documents, US Government Printing Office, Washington DC 20402.

Kramer, John H. and Steffensmeier, Darrell S., The Differential Detention/Jailing of Juveniles: A Comparison of Detention and Non-Detention Courts, 5 Pepperdine Law Review 3 (1978).

Levin, Mark M. and Rosemary C. Sarri, Juvenile Delinquency: A Comparative Analysis of Legal Codes in the United States, Ann Arbor, Michigan: National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, 1974.
Contact National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI 48109.

National Criminal Justice Information and Statistical Service, Local Jails--A Report Presenting Data for Individual County and City Jails from the 1970 National Jail Census, Washington, D.C., Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1973.

Management and Behavioral Science Center, University of Pennsylvania, Planning and Designing for Juvenile Justice, Washington, D.C.: LEAA, August, 1972.
Contact Superintendent of Documents, US Government Printing Office, Washington DC 20402.

National Center for Youth Law, Children in Jails: Legal Strategies and Materials, St. Louis, Missouri: NCYL, St. Louis University, 1978.

National Coalition for Children's Justice, Inspecting Children's Institutions, Princeton, New Jersey, 1977.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Standards and Guides for the Detention of Children and Youth, New York, New York: NCCD, 1961.

National Council of Jewish Women, Justice for Children--Children's Rights: Six Steps to Justice for Children, New York, New York, 1975.

Note, The Constitutional Controversy of a Juvenile's Right to Bail in Juvenile Preadjudicatory Proceedings, 1 Hasting Law Quarterly 215 (1974).

National Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice Standards and Goals, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, D.C.: LEAA, 1977.
Contact Superintendent of Documents.

National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture, Intake Planning, Monograph E2 in the Guildeines for the Planning and Design of State Court Programs and Facilities, Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
Contact National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture, 505 East Green, Suite 200, Champaign IL 61820.

National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service, Children in Custody: Advance Report on the Juvenile Detention and Correction Facility Census of 1972-1973, Washington, D.C.: LEAA, May, 1975.
Contact Superintendent of Documents, US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. #027-000-00333-18.

Olson, Jay and George H. Shepard, Intake Screening Guides: Improving Justice for Juveniles, Washington, D.C.: HEW, February, 1975.
Contact Superintendent of Documents, US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

Pappenfort, Donnell M. and Thomas M. Young, Use of Secure Detention for Juveniles and Alternatives to Its Use, Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, March, 1977.
Contact School of Social Science Administration, University of Chicago, 969 East 60th Street, Chicago IL 60637.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, Washington, D.C.: PCLEA, 1967.
Contact Superintendent of Documents, US Government Printing Office, Washington DC 20402. #040-000-00102-6.

Report of the Advisory Committee to the Administrator on Standards to the Administration of Juvenile Justice Standards on Adjudication, Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1977.

Rutherford, Andrew and Osman Bengur, Community-Based Alternatives to Juvenile Incarceration, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1976.
Contact Superintendent of Documents, US Government Printing Office, Washington DC 20402.

Sarri, Rosemary C., Under Lock and Key: Juveniles in Jails and Detention, Ann Arbor, Michigan: National Assessment of Juvenile Correction, December, 1974.
Contact National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI 48109.

Simet, Anne S., A Constitutional Right to Release or Bail for Juveniles, 6 Capital University Law Review 4, 1977.

United States Congress, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 as Amended Through October 3, 1977.
Contact Superintendent of Documents, US Government Printing Office, Washington DC 20402.

Weintraub, Judith F., Symposium on Status Offenders: Manual for Action, New York, New York: National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1976.
Contact National Council of Jewish Women, 15 East 26th Street, Eighth Floor, New York NY 10010.